

ENVIRONMENT, TECHNOLOGY
AND SOCIETY

Number 62

Winter 1990

NEWSLETTER OF THE SECTION ON ENVIRONMENT AND TECHNOLOGY,
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Officers of the ASA Section
on Environment and Technology:

Chair:

William R. Freudenburg
1989-1990

Chair-Elect:

Allan Schnaiberg
1989-1991

Secretary-Treasurer:

J. Stanley Black

Council:

Barbara Farhar
1990-1993

Eugene Rosa
1990-1993

Carole Seyfrit
1988-1991

Thomas Hood
1988-1991

Andrew Szasz
1989-1992

Gary Williams
1989-1992

**Committee Chairs,
1990-1991:**

Program

Allan Schnaiberg

Nominations

Gary Williams

Liaison

Gene Rosa

Awards

Allan Schnaiberg

Membership

Carole Seyfrit

CONTENTS

Public Involvement in Environmental Restoration:
Inadequacies of Federal Guidance on Data Collection
for Superfund (CERCLA) Community Interviews

Edwin J. Rossman2

Environmentalism in the South: Neo-Malthusianism,
Women's Rights, and the Population Control Movement

Craig R. Humphrey5

Comments on "*The Political Origins of the EPA*"

Errol Meidinger8

New outlets 10

Post-doctoral fellowships 11

Membership news and notes..... 11

Annual meetings..... 11

EDITOR

Allan Schnaiberg

Department of Sociology, Northwestern University
1810 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, IL 60208-1330
[Phone: 708-491-3202; FAX: 708-491-9907]

Contributing Editors [1990-91]

Open for self-nominations

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION: INADEQUACIES OF FEDERAL GUIDANCE ON DATA COLLECTION FOR SUPERFUND (CERCLA) COMMUNITY INTERVIEWS*

Edwin J. Rossman

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District
P.O. Box 61, Tulsa, OK 74121-0061

The United States Federal Government will be involved in an unprecedented amount of environmental restoration during the next decade. Risks to the public and how to avert those risks are socially defined (Douglas and Wildavsky 1983). As a result, disagreements emerge over both the correct interpretation of the situation and the proper role of citizens and "experts" in dealing with the problem (Couch and Kroll-Smith 1985). Two critical challenges to those responsible for restoration activities are to identify how communities define their environmental problems and to develop a socially implementable clean-up.

While large amounts of resources have been committed to environmental restoration, systematic methods of describing the social context of restoration are not always practiced. Laws and regulations implementing those laws have been enacted, with at least some recognition of the social context in which environmental restoration takes place. These laws have mandated evaluating communities' definitions of environmental concerns and integrating these definitions in the decision making process. Yet, some of the basic tools of sociological practice have been ignored in establishing guidance for planning environmental clean-up actions.

One of the most important laws in dealing with environmental restoration has been and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (popularly known as the Superfund Act or CERCLA). CERCLA is a broad piece of legislation which specifies how environmentally contaminated areas are cleaned up:

The President shall provide for the participation of interested person, including potentially responsible parties, in the development of the administrative record on which the President will base the selection of remedial actions...

The Procedures under this subparagraph shall include:

- (i) Notices to potentially affected person and the public, which shall be accompanied by a brief analysis of the plan and alternative plans that were considered.
- (ii) A reasonable opportunity to comment and provide information regarding the plan.
- (iii) An opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area.
- (iv.) A response to each of the significant comments, criticisms and new data submitted in written or oral presentation.
- (v) A statement of the basis and purpose of the selected action. [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980; Section 133, subsection K]

Section 105 of CERCLA mandated the Environmental Protection Agency to develop a National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) for implementing CERCLA. The Plan states:

The lead agency [involved in the clean-up activity] shall develop and implement a formal community relations plan... Such plans must specify the communication activities which will be undertaken during the response and shall include provision for public comment period on the alternative ... A document which summarizes the major issues raised by the public and how they are addressed must be included in the decision document approving the [environmental clean-up] remedy. [National Archives of the United States; Section 300.67]

The Community Relations Plan Handbook is a step-by-step manual for those implementing EPA policy (EPA, 1988). These EPA objectives in community relations (not to be confused with public relations) are to: (1) give

the public the opportunity to comment on and provide input to technical decisions; (2) inform the public of planned or ongoing actions and; (3) focus and resolve conflict, when possible. It indicates that public input can "provide valuable information on local history, citizen involvement, and site conditions" and enable development of a response to environmental problems "that are more responsive to community needs" (EPA 1988: p. 1-2).

The information required for meeting these objectives includes collecting data from those groups involved in the environmental problem. This information may include data from those groups living adjacent to contaminated site or it may include data from groups living many miles away, yet having the perception of that they are at risk. EPA terms the process of data collection as "community interviews". The purpose of the community interviews is to determine how the various affected groups define the environmental problem, to determine the best way for the various groups to receive information about environmental conditions associated with a contaminated area, and to establish the best ways those groups can communicate their concerns to those making decisions about the environmental clean-up process. What follows is a critique of the methodological adequacy of this handbook.

The EPA handbook notes that the "...success of community relations planning depends first and foremost on community interviews" (EPA 1988, p. 3-1). Based on information collected in the interviews, the plan outlines specific actions to be taken to insure public involvement in the environmental restoration. Despite the emphasis on the community interviews, though, the EPA document provides minimal guidance on how to select a sample, how to conduct the community interview, or how to analyze the data.

Curiously, the EPA guidebook does not use the term "sample" in discussing how to select individuals for the community interviews. The guidebook suggests using key informants as the best method of developing a list for a prospective community interview respondents. Previous mailing lists, names of persons mailing letters concerning environmental issues to public officials, newspaper articles, list of county, city

and other officials are some of the suggested starting points for beginning the sampling. The guidebook also strongly suggests that community interviews include asking the respondent to list other individuals who might be interested in the environmental clean-up at a given site.

In essence the EPA guidance is recommending a nonprobability sample. The first stage is a sampling method that is often termed purposive sampling. The second phase is based upon a "snowball" sample where initial participants in the sample are used to identify others sample candidates. Simply, the initial respondents are asked if they know anyone else that might have interests in clean-up site. "Nonprobability sample" is a term never used. Perhaps this term would suggest to decision makers within the engineering community (the dominant culture within the EPA and many other federal agencies) that such techniques are "unscientific."

Yet no other alternative sample techniques are offered in this or other EPA publications on community relations planning. Without properly addressing sampling issues, those in the field may well end up with a sample with an unknown bias. There may well be groups that are left out of the sample that represent an important part of the affected community. The worst case scenario could occur if an interested party deliberately skewed the sample in one direction or another, without the knowledge of those conducting the final analysis. The biggest drawback of using a nonprobability sample is the difficulty in generalizing to the larger population. At one extreme, the results may be nothing more than a summary of the attitudes and opinions of only those individuals participating in the interviews.

EPA handbook advice on community interviews stresses the importance of face-to-face nonstructured interviews. The guidebook suggests some relevant questions to be asked. For example, the guidance recommends that interviewers ask respondents about problems with property near the clean-up site, the sorts of contacts respondents have had with government officials regarding the site, and major concerns about the site. Yet nowhere does the EPA defend its implication that the unstructured interview situation is the most desirable technique. As stated in the EPA (1988, pp. 3-6) "In the final

analysis, the best questions are usually those that arise spontaneously during a discussion".

The handbook does not mention how questions or discussion of topics should be sequenced during the course of the community interview. No discussion of how the sequencing of questions could influence responses is provided. Spontaneity that emerges in the community interviews may result in an unmanageable collection of responses to unstructured questions. The handbook thus ignores all the validity and reliability issues in its applied research.

Finally, the EPA handbook is completely silent on the issue of data analysis. The implication is that a general impressions of attitudes and opinions can be generated from the interviews and that becomes the basis upon which public participation is to be based.

The focus of this article has been on the 1988 EPA Handbook. It is a "interim version" of some future document. Future guidance on collecting data for community relations plans may help clarify the issues raised in this paper. Yet this preliminary guidebook ignores the extensive social science literature and many established methodologies.

"Community relations" and "public relations" are not analogous. Public relations implies persuasion of a group of people to a predetermine point of view. However, the intent of community relations is first to understand the nature of the community in terms of its view of the environmental problems and second, to develop two-way communication between the various elements of the community and decision makers. It is critical that systematic methodologies be employed in conducting the community interviews. Both qualitative or quantitative techniques can be useful in collecting data about the community. However, a clear understanding of the application of those techniques is essential if the desired goal is to be achieved. Many federal agencies dominated by "hard science" oriented decision makers fail to appreciated the complexities of the social sciences. As a result, community relations plans may be conducted without involvement of social scientists or explicit guidance. Sociologists have unique qualifications: they grasp the concept of community and how to study it, and they have an

appreciation of the social context of environmental problems. Though geological, chemical, or other physical processes may be understood outside the social context, human behavior initiating, intervening, and regulating these processes can not. Sociologists understand that the social context can not be adequately understood in a haphazard way. In order to achieve the general goal of public participation in developing environmental clean-up alternatives, decision makers must rely on data that has to be collected with systematic methods.

*The views expressed in this paper reflect solely those of the author.

References:

Couch S. & Kroll-Smith, J. S.(1985). The chronic technical disaster: Toward a social scientific perspective. Social Science Quarterly, 66, 564-575.

Comprehensive Environmental Recovery, Compensation and Liability Act; 42 U. S. C. 9605, as amended in 1986.

Douglas, M.B. & Wildavsky, A .(1983). Risk and Culture. Berkeley: University of California Press.

National Archives of the United States (1988), Code of Federal Regulation (CFR); 40 C. F. R. part 300; "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Plan".

United States Environmental Protection Agency (1988) The Community Relations Plan Handbook, Interim Version. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

ENVIRONMENTALISM IN THE SOUTH: NEO-MALTHUSIANISM, WOMEN'S RIGHTS, AND THE POPULATION CONTROL MOVEMENT

Craig R. Humphrey
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Vibrant worldwide environmentalism manifests itself in the developing nations of the southern hemisphere (South) through a growing interest in sustainable economic development, including neo-Malthusian population policies (World Commission in Development, 1987). Defined as intergenerationally replicable economic growth, sustainable development policies contain the tripartite goals of eliminating poverty, fully integrating women in the development process, and protecting the rights of nonhumans. The full integration of women in the development process involves state intervention to eliminate illiteracy and expand public education, economic development so that men and women will participate on an equitable basis in the labor market, and safe, voluntary family planning programs of all kinds. This last aspect of sustainable development policy, neo-Malthusianism, is the focus of my essay.

While it has been clearly demonstrated that natural resource scarcity and pollution are caused by institutional forces vastly more complex than rapid population growth (Schnaiberg, 1981; O'Connor, 1988), population policies continue to be a focal point for policy-makers with an interest in sustainable economic development. It is important to note that nations as vastly different as western Europe and communist China have experienced considerable gains in agricultural self-sufficiency during the past decade, in part because of dramatic declines in population growth (Brown, 1988). Moreover, the study of how nations develop and change population policies tells us something about how societies struggle with environmental issues, even if these efforts are in vain.

The international flow of monetary support for family planning, the ratio of public to private funding, and the ability of nations in the South to continue the development of neo-Malthusian policies will be a subject of some interest in environmental sociology over this decade. Largely as a gesture of support for the New Rights coalition of right-to-life activists, Protestant fundamentalists, and the conservatives in the Republican Party, the Reagan administration shifted the official position of the United States with respect to support for family planning in the South for the first time since 1966 (Finkle and Crane, 1985; Crane and Finkle, 1989). The new position initially was announced at the International Conference on Population at Mexico City in 1984. The United States would maintain a position of neutrality with regard to the question of whether rapid population growth causes poverty and damages the environment. We would also encourage private investment and trade with developing countries as a mode of development. In addition, the United States would cease funding all nongovernmental family planning organizations directly or indirectly encouraging abortion or supporting other groups so involved.

The consequences of the New Right-oriented population policy of the United States are largely unknown, but we have played a major role in the development and continuation of family planning programs in the South. The shift in U.S. policy, therefore, is a significant one worthy of some scholarly attention. One observer (Camp, 1987) notes a number of potential consequences. Nongovernmental organizations working to extend abortion services to low income women will no longer receive U.S. funding. Women will then seek

abortion services that are separate from family planning clinics at some risk to their health. They may not simultaneously receive family planning information and contraceptives, and this may impair their ability to avoid any future need for an abortion.

The shift in funding of abortion programs from private to public agencies will also impair the efforts of what Camp (1987) considers to be "the most flexible and innovative" private groups, including church affiliated mission hospitals, labor unions, businesses, and women's organizations. In addition, social science and biomedical research on abortion could be adversely affected. To the extent that research promotes better medical practices and more informed women, the policy has obvious and significant implications for the health and safety of lower income women and their children.

While the United States has shifted to a more conservative stance with regard to international family planning, many developing countries have stepped-up governmental involvement with neo-Malthusian policies. The People's Republic of China (PRC), of course, is the leading exemplar. As early as 1971 the PRC encouraged delayed marriage, longer intervals between births, and two children per family, the "later-longer-fewer" policy. Chinese neo-Malthusianism became a subject of controversy with the publication of Central Document 7 in 1984, (Bongaarts and Greenhalgh, 1985), a ruling prohibiting more than one child for urban couples and more than two children in rural areas. The ruling followed a more than sixty percent decline in completed family size between 1970 and 1980, the most precipitous decline in natality in human history.

The Document was based in national goals to develop the four modernizations: agriculture, industry, science, and defense. Research by Chinese ecologists and U.N. demographers during the late 1970s indicated that the PRC could not remain agriculturally self-sufficient with a population greater than

1.2 billion, a size they could expect as early as the year 2000. China had already lost 20-30 million people through a severe famine after de-linking from the Soviets in the 1950s, and the Chinese elders were not going to endure tragedy again (Liebersohn, 1986).

The increasingly aggressive Marxian Malthusianism of the PRC has set off a wave of critical scholarly observations. It is noted that countries with one-child policies and deep cultural tradition of patrilineal descent can inadvertently encourage female infanticide (Hull, 1990) and the physical abuse to women bearing a female child (Finkle and Crane, 1985). In a related criticism, it is noted that PRC neo-Malthusianism is a form of population control, not family planning (Hartman, 1987). The latter involves the expansion of rights for women to choose freely. It also involves an expansion in the rights of women to education, and the provision of safe contraceptives and supportive clinics. Population control, on the other hand, involves the attainment of target rates of fertility designed by state officials. High technology medicine in the form of IUDs, pills, and hospitals take precedent over more traditional methods such as condoms and diaphragms, and the health and rights of women are restricted (Hartman, 1987). Moreover, the leveling off of population at 1.2 billion probably could be achieved with a two-child policy linked to legal sanctions on the age of marriage and longer birth intervals (Bongaarts and Greenhalgh, 1985).

While controversies over the PRC's Marxian Malthusianism will continue, it has not stopped other developing countries from becoming more and more sympathetic to neo-Malthusianism and its related demographic policies. Observers of the International Conference on Population at Mexico City in 1984 say that the "South"...no longer spoke of international population assistance as racist, genocidal, or imperialistic, or accused Western nations of advocating population control as a substitute for foreign aid (Finkle and Crane, 1985:1)." Street demonstrations

and accusations that the conveners were intellectual and political elites out of touch with the needs of the poor did occur at the Mexico City Conference (Hartman, 1987), but the weight of population, poverty, glutted commodity markets, and the like had moved people closer to Malthusianism, for better or worse.

At the Amsterdam Forum on Population in the 21st Century, held in 1989, the North and the South once again reinforced their commitment to neo-Malthusianism. Countries are struggling to achieve the U.N. medium projection of 6.25 billion people in the year 2000, 8.5 billion in 2025, and the leveling off of world population at 10-11 billion people by the year 2100 (Sadik, 1990). The Amsterdam Declaration also has the goal of an infant mortality rate equal to no more than 50 deaths per 1000 live births; substantial reductions in maternal mortality, including death from illegal abortions; and a worldwide female literacy rate of no less than seventy percent.

Achieving these targets will not be easy, given the newly emerging neutral stance of the Executive Branch of the United States and the policy of shunning abortion programs run by nongovernmental organizations worldwide. The U.S. has been a leading figure in neo-Malthusianism for nearly twenty-years, and a chief source of funding. Of course, groups such as International Planned Parenthood Federation or the United Nations Population Fund could seek private donors or additional support from more liberal European governments, thereby neutralizing at least some of the consequences encouraged by U.S. policy. Environmental organizations and women's groups in the United States could also coalesce, creating the possibility of a return to more liberal policies in the United States. Whether any of these scenarios lead to voluntary family planning and other goals embedded in sustainable development or a less enhancing, narrow focus on population control with targets, incentives, and a restricted range of contraceptive practices is an important issue in understanding the

growing aura of environmental throughout the world, particularly because of its relevance to women and impoverished people in the North and South.

References:

Bongaarts, John and Susan Greenhalgh. 1985. "An alternative to the one-child policy in China." Population and Development Review. Vol. 11 (December): 585-617.

Brown, Lester. 1988. "The Changing World Food Prospect: the nineties and beyond." Worldwatch Institute Paper No. 85. Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Institute.

Camp, Sharon. 1987. "The impact of the Mexico City policy on women and health care in developing countries." New York University Journal of International Law and Politics. Vol. 20: 35-51.

Crane, Barbara B. and Jason L. Finkle. 1989. "The United States, China, and the United Nations Population Fund." Population and Development Review. Vol. 15 (March): 23-60.

Finkle, Jason L. and Barbara B. Crane. 1985. "The United States at the International Conference on Population." Population and Development Review. Vol. 11 (March): 1-28.

Hartman, Betsy. 1987. Reproductive Rights and Wrongs. The Global Politics of Population Control and Contraceptive Choice. New York: Harper and Row.

Hull, Terence H. 1990. "Recent trends in sex ratios in China." Population and Development Review. Vol. 16 (March): 63-84.

Liebersohn, Jonathan. 1986. "Too many people?" New York Review of Books. Vol. 33 (June 26): 36-42.

O'Connor, James. 1988. "Capitalism, nature, socialism: a theoretical introduction."

Capitalism, Nature, Socialism. A Journal of Socialist Ecology. Vol. 1. (Fall): 11-38.

Sadik, Nafis. 1990. The State of World Population. New York: United Nations Population Fund.

Schnaiberg, Allan. 1981. "Will population slowdowns yield resource conservation?"

Some social demurrers." Qualitative Sociology. Vol. 4. (Spring): 21-33.

The World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. Our Common Future. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

COMMENTS ON "THE POLITICAL ORIGINS OF THE EPA"

Errol Meidinger

School of Law - SUNY/Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260

As always, it is a difficult business reading "structural political limits" in the tea leaves (or flotsam and jetsam) of regulatory organization decisions. There are a number of alternative readings of some of the events Theodore Tsoukalas (*E,T & S*, #60) represents. The first part of the article provides a cogent summary. The Bush administration primary problem with the House reorganization bill apparently is a fear that the agency might become too independent of presidential control; at a higher level of generality this probably means too activist and too bothersome to industry. However, some of the organizational analysis packed into the discussion of the issue seems a bit skewed. It is not clear, for example, that the creation of ombuds offices has any particular structural significance. The political meaning of helping "individuals, corporations and communities deal with agency regulations" is vague at best. It may have budgetary implications, of course, at which point the general executive preference for avoiding increased budget expenditures come into play. This is not necessarily a bad thing, however; requiring regulated information dissemination and communication may well have progressive distributional and political implications.

Similarly, it is not clear that consolidating all environmental quality

jurisdiction in the EPA would improve environmental protection. "Fragmentation" can be a positive factor if it means that a particular problem or perspective is given central prominence by an agency or subagency competing for budget dollars, since the agency has an incentive to promote the importance of the problem. This arrangement may be environmentally preferable to having the issue buried among hundreds of others in an agency charged with settings internal priorities (and therefore burying issues) and having a natural tendency toward a standard line of analysis.

Whether fragmentation is or is not a bad thing seems to depend on the nature of the problems at issue. Where there is high uncertainty, boggling complexity, political volatility, and a variety of plausible analytical models, as is the case with many environmental problems, it may well be desirable to have some fragmented and competitive jurisdiction. I have a hard time concluding on either a priori or empirical grounds, for example, that it is a bad thing for NOAA and EPA to produce competing analyses and prescriptions for Global Climate Change. The same could be said of a number of other problems (for a parallel argument, see Bendor, 1975). Of course fragmented environmental jurisdiction sometimes seems to have more clearly pernicious effects, as in

the allocation of most environmental issues regarding nuclear power regulation to the NRC. But the problem is not fragmentation verses consolidation. Primarily, it is the pro-nuclear regulatory regime established and retained by the Congress. Secondly, however, it is important to note that the system was characterized and understood as a consolidated regime when it was created. If the problem is defined as nuclear power regulation, then the system is centralized. If it is defined as environmental regulation, then the system is not centralized. One of the points this definitional reversal serves to emphasize is the dependence of the term on the prior (and perhaps inherently changing) social definition of the problem. And I doubt whether changes in such definitions can be reduced to functions of structural limitations.

Finally a few points about the early history of EPA. The article contains no citations, so it is hard to assess its historical veracity. Perhaps it is based on information I have simply not come across. In any event, it is worth noting that the prehistory of the agency in the Nixon administration is often described a bit differently. At the outset of his administration, Nixon appointed a group headed by businessman Roy Ash (ever since referred to as the Ash Council) to review the organization and operation of the federal administrative agencies. Nixon was initially quite enthusiastic about the Council's recommendation that a mega-agency be created which would consolidate not only environmental regulation but also the environmental management activities carried on by such agencies as Interior and Agriculture. Perhaps he thought that by accepting this recommendation he might trump competing politicians like Senator Muskie as the top champion of environmental protection (e.g. , Elliott, Ackerman and Millian, 1985). Perhaps Nixon also thought that he could in fact prevent the agency from being too activist because it would be loaded with all sorts of conflicting interests, constituencies, and staffers. Whether he focused on this possibility or not is unclear. That it is likely to have been the case can be

supported simply by noting the widely accepted conclusion that the most lackadaisical, least effective branch of the EPA has long been the one charged with regulating pesticides, which was moved there from the USDA.

In any event, it is not entirely clear what brought the mega-agency plan down inside the executive. John Quarles, general counsel to Ruckelshaus (presumably the administrator referred to in the article) claimed it was a dispute over another issue (the Vietnam war, if I remember correctly) that erupted between Nixon and Walter Hickel, the former governor of Alaska who was at that time Secretary of the Interior and the heir apparent to head the new agency (Quarles, 1976). Perhaps there was a larger "structural limitation" at work, but perhaps the decision was quite arbitrary, and could have gone either way. I tend toward the latter reading primarily because it seems to me very possible that a mega-agency would have been less protective of environmental values and less troublesome to industry than the one that emerged.

The implication that the Congressional decision not to subject many environmental regulation and permitting processes to NEPA's EIS requirements generally weakened environmental regulation also seems a bit simplistic. In the first place, although many social scientists (including me) have long been proponents of the EIS process, its beneficial environmental effects do not seem overly impressive (a point that is of course consistent with Tsoukalas' general thesis). Again, this seems to be due primarily to the kinds of social organizational factors noted above. Second, the policy effects of the EIS process depend greatly on what the agency is trying to do. It seems to me that the primary predictable effect of requiring an EIS is to delay agency action. If the agency is engaged in environmental degradation, then the EIS requirement is more likely to be environmentally beneficial. If it is trying to curb private environmental degradation, then it may not be. Of course, sometimes going through an EIS process will

change not only the timing but also the substance of an agency action by virtue of forcing the agency to publicize the proposed action, describe its effects, and respond to comments -- and thereby potentially change its mind. Third, these potential benefits are also present in much non-EIS regulatory decision making, since other statutory provisions require agencies to go through analogous processes of public notice, comment, and explanation. Most important regulatory decisions of the EPA, for example, are subject to process requirements quite similar to those of NEPA. It is possible that the agency has more discretion to decide general issues in one big proceeding than a number of small ones, but NEPA cases like Sierra Club v. Kleppe (which allowed the BLM to satisfy many NEPA requirements regarding its coal leasing activities in one big proceeding) make even that proposition questionable. For this reason, it is useful to understand NEPA not as a radical new development in federal policy making, but as an extension of public participation requirements to many decisions that had previously been treated as "committed to agency discretion" or otherwise not subject to defined analysis and participation requirements. The most "radical" part of the EIS requirement was to require that agencies "consider" the environmental implications of their actions; EPA is just as much required to "consider" the environmental implications of its actions as any agency subject to NEPA.

In closing, I wish to suggest that the Tsoukalas note seems to reflect a somewhat nostalgic faith in centralized rational-comprehensive planning. In the view presented, a comprehensive, mega-regulatory organization would not only be better for the environment, but also more democratically responsive. On both the empirical and theoretical grounds suggested above, these claims are problematic. It seems probable that other factors -- primarily the sociopolitical relations of the agency, industry, and public interest groups -- will set the structural possibilities and constraints of environmental regulation. Those constraints, however, are

likely to be indeterminate for a number of issues and renegotiable for others. This is both bad and good news. On the one hand, environmental problems cannot be disposed of simply by creating a rational comprehensive mega-agency. On the other, the lack of such an agency does not necessarily mean that major environmental problems cannot be effectively addressed. That remains to be seen.

References:

Bendor, Jonathon B. (1985) Parallel Systems: Redundancy in Government. Berkeley: University of California Press

Elliott, Donald, Bruce A. Ackerman, and John C. Millian (1985) "Toward a Theory of Statutory Evolution: The Federalization of Environmental Law", Journal of Law, Economics and Organization, 1:313:335

Quarles, John (1976) Cleaning Up America: An Insider's View of the Environmental Protection Agency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

NEW OUTLETS

An International Working Group on Environmental Institutions is taking shape under the auspices of the Law and Society Association, the Sociology of Law section of the International Sociological Association, and several other scholarly associations. The goal of the working group is to develop a comparative international understanding of the social organization of environmental regulation in different countries, and possible to contribute to the improvement of environmental regulatory institutions in coming years. In sociological terms the group is probably best characterized as devoted to applied studies of the social control of industrial enterprise.

The working group will meet at the joint meetings of the above named association June through in Amsterdam. The three hours of working group sessions will be devoted to

discussion of previously circulated studies and development of future research agendas. To provide a some preliminary comparability, the studies will be of air pollution regulation in various countries. As indicated above they will focus on the social negotiation and organization of pollution regulation (rather than e.g. on legal mandates, formal authority, and the like.) Completed papers must be mailed to participants by May 1, 1991.

Gjalt Huppes of Leiden University and I are serving as coleaders of the groups. For the time being I have better access to most of the group paper work. So if you wish to participate in or find out more about the group, it is probably most efficient to write me at the Faculty of Law and Jurisprudence, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14260 or call at 716/636-2159. (Gjalt's address is Centre for Environmental Studies, Leiden University, Garenmarkt 1a, P.O. Box 9518, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands. Phone: .31/71-277486)

...

Article submissions to Law and Policy, a refereed journal which I co-edit with Keith Hawkins of Oxford are encouraged. The journal publishes papers addressing a wide array of policy areas (environment, health, family, public finance, etc.) and utilizing a variety of methodologies. I expect its primary attractions to readers of this newsletter are its receptivity to policy discussions supported but not necessarily dictated by empirical findings, and its substantial readership in the law and policy fields. Editorial offices are at the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy, O'Brien Hall -- North Campus, State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y. 14260. We would be happy to send you a copy of our style sheet and (very short) editorial policy. If you have a question about our policies feel free to write me at the above address or to call at 716/636-2159.

Errol Meidinger

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

The Pembroke Center for Teaching and Research on Women, at Brown University, is inviting applications for **post-doctoral fellowships**. Non-tenured scholars are invited to apply for the 1991-92 research project on *Scientific Knowledge and 'Difference'* (defined in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, or class). The project will explore the interface between humanistic and scientific concerns, including epistemological issues, science education, and science literacy. Stipends are \$21,000, and third-world and minority scholars are especially welcomed.

Application to the Center [Box 1958, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912] are due by **December 14, 1990**; candidates will be notified of results by March 3, 1991.

Advanced scholars interested in the topic may also apply for affiliation with the Center.

Phil Brown.

MEMBERSHIP NEWS & NOTES

T.R. Durham [Business Dept., Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866] is especially interested in media coverage of environmental controversies in the post-World War II period.

Desmond M. Connor [Connor Development Services, 5096 Catalina Terrace, Victoria, BC V8Y 2A5; tel 604-658-1323] has available a *How to Do It* video and book on preventing and resolving public controversies. These are available for rental (\$145/day) or purchase (\$475).

ANNUAL MEETINGS

As noted in earlier *ET & S* issues, please send annual section meeting papers to Allan Schnaiberg or special session ones to Carole Seyfrit [Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762].

TO: Members of the Environment and Technology Section, ASA

FROM: Allan Schnaiberg, Dept. of Soc., Northwestern U., 1810 Chicago, Evanston, IL 60208

PLEASE SEND THIS TEAR-OFF SHEET OR A COPY FOR INCLUSION IN FORTHCOMING EDITIONS OF THE NEWSLETTER. MANY THANKS.

Your current research interest[s] you'd like to share with others:

New literature you've published, or found especially helpful. Give full citations.

Forthcoming meetings and conferences. Calls for papers. Papers you've recently presented.

Activities of related social science environmental groups.

Name: _____

Address: _____